



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,048	06/26/2001	Harold Kutz	CYPR-CD00231	4180
7590 01/12/2006			EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			WOO, STELLA L	
Two North Market Street, Third Floor San Jose, CA 95113			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
5m; 5000, 011			2643	

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/893,048	KUTZ ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Stella L. Woo	2643			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE and the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 O	ctober 2005.				
′=	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	epted or b)⊡ objected to by the E drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12)[a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)				
3) 🔯 Inform	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/28/05</u> .		atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/893,048 Page 2

Art Unit: 2643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-2, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Insenser Farre et al. (US 6,460,172 B1, hereinafter "Insenser Farre") in view of Cameron et al. (US 6,051,772, hereinafter "Cameron").

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Insenser Farre discloses a microcontroller chip (field programmable system-on-a-chip) comprising:

a processor (microcontroller 2);

an array of configurable circuit blocks (array of programmable digital macro cells 3 and a set of programmable analog cells 4); and

an on-chip analog amplifier (analog subsystem 4 includes a user programmable amplifier; col. 4, lines 38-40).

Insenser Farre differs from claims 1 and 8 in that it does not specify driving a loudspeaker external to the microcontroller chip. However, Insenser Farre does teach use of the microcontroller chip in a communication application (col. 6, lines 21-22) and Cameron teaches the well known use of a sound chip for driving a loudspeaker (speaker 34) external to the sound chip (Figure 7) such that it would have been obvious

Application/Control Number: 09/893,048

Art Unit: 2643

to an artisan of ordinary skill to use the microcontroller chip of Insenser Farre for driving a loudspeaker, as taught by Cameron.

Regarding claim 2, in Insenser Farre, the amplifier 4 appears to be situated adjacent one of the four corners (see Figure 1).

Regarding claims 9, 10, Insenser Farre provides analog input/output pads 6.

3. Claims 4-6, 11-12, 14-15, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Insenser Farre in view of Cameron, and further in view of Hirose et al. (US 5,900,780, hereinafter "Hirose").

The combination of Insenser Farre and Cameron differs from claims 4-6, 11-12, 14-15, 17 in that it does not specify the analog amplifer as being a tristate CMOS analog amplifier. However, Hirose teaches the advantages of using a tristate CMOS operational amplifier in an audio amplifier circuit including low power consumption, small distortion in output waveform, and high output drive capacity (col. 1, lines 12-30) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such use of a CMOS amplifier, as taught by Hirose, within the signal chip audio system combination of Insenser Farre and Cameron for providing a low-power, low-distortion, high output analog amplifier function.

4. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Insenser Farre and Cameron, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dijkmans et al. (US 4,608,502, hereinafter "Dijkmans").

The combination of Insenser Farre and Cameron differs from claim 3 in that it does not specify a switchable current source. However, Dijkmans teaches the well

known use of a switchable current source for providing volume control of an audio amplifier (Abstract; col. 2, line 60 – col. 3, line 57) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to use a switchable current source, as taught to be well known by Dijkmans, for providing volume control in the combination of Insenser Farre and Cameron (in Insenser Farre, microcontroller 2 controls integrated circuit functions).

5. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Insenser Farre in view of Cameron, and further in view of Billings (US 5,248,843).

The combination of Insenser Farre and Cameron differs from claim 7 in that it does not specify that the external speaker is a 32-ohm speaker. However, Billings teaches the well known use of a 32 ohm speaker which is controlled by an sound chip (col. 6, lines 1-8) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate select a 32 ohm speaker, as taught by, as the speaker which is driven by the combination of Insenser Farre and Cameron.

- 6. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Insenser Farre, Cameron and Hirose, as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Dijkmans for the same reasons applied to claim 3 above.
- 7. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Insenser Farre, Cameron and Hirose, as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Billings for the same reasons applied to claim 7 above.
- 8. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Insenser Farre, Cameron and Djikmans, as applied to claim 3 above, and further in view of Hirose for the same reasons applied to claim 4 above.

Application/Control Number: 09/893,048 Page 5

Art Unit: 2643

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stella L. Woo whose telephone number is (571) 272-7512. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday, Thursday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (571) 272-7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stella L. Woo Primary Examiner Art Unit 2643